

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims are being amended. Claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 11-17, 19 and 21-23 are pending.

Allowable subject matter

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 19 and 21 are allowed, and that claims 8 and 14-17 contain allowable subject matter.

Rejection under 35 U. S. C. § 103

Claims 1, 9, 13, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,331,816 to Myllymaki (“Myllymaki”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,774,782 to Runyon et al. (“Runyon”). This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons given below.

Claim 1 is directed to a security system and recites “mode switching reminder means for causing a remote alarm device located at a remote place to present mode change reminder information, when the outing motion detection sensor detects that the non-monitored person has left the monitored area, the non-monitored person detecting sensor does not detect any other non-monitored person, and the non-alert mode has been set.” Thus, in claim 1, the mode switching reminder means is such that when the outing motion detection sensor detects that the non-monitored person has left the monitored area, the non-monitored person detecting sensor does not detect any other non-monitored person, and the non-alert mode has been set, a remote alarm device located at a remote place is caused to present mode change reminder information. Neither Myllymaki nor Runyon discloses this feature, either alone, or in combination.

Myllymaki does not disclose or suggest as recited in claim 1, “causing a remote alarm device located at a remote place to present mode change reminder information, when the non-

monitored person detecting sensor does not detect any other non-monitored person, and the non-alert mode has been set”.

Myllymaki discloses that when a user steps out of an apartment, an infrasound sensor 9 provides information about the opening of a door, and a processor 8 switches on a burglar monitor 17 (col. 2, lines 31-42). Even if Myllymaki were modified such that the security system sent a reminder to a user to set the burglar alarm as the user left the apartment, however, nowhere does either Myllymaki or Runyon suggest that the reminder should be sent when a monitored person detecting sensor does not detect another person in the apartment. Neither Myllymaki nor Runyon discloses an arrangement in which a security system reminds a user to change the mode of the security system to an alert mode as soon as a person leaves a monitored area, and there is no other person detected in the monitored area. Thus, even if Myllymaki and Runyon were combined, they would not have all the features of claim 1.

If the Myllymaki system were modified as suggested in the Office Action to include a reminder to present mode change information, the resultant system would constitute an inefficient arrangement, as compared to the system of claim 1. This is so because the modified Myllymaki security system would remind a user to change the mode of the security system to an alert mode even when a person still exists in the monitored area, and it is unnecessary for the security system to remind the user in that instance. On the other hand, in claim 1, the security system is arranged to remind a user to change the mode of the security system to an alert mode as soon as a person leaves a monitored area, and there is no other person detected in the monitored area, so that the security system does not wastefully remind the user to change the mode to the alert mode when a person still exists in a monitored area and it is unnecessary for the security system to remind the user to change the mode to the alert mode.

Independent claim 9 recites “the mode switching means automatically switching to the alert mode when the outing motion detection sensor detects that the non-monitored person has left the monitored area, the non-monitored person detecting sensor does not detect any other non-monitored person, and the non-alert mode has been set”, and is thus patentable for reasons analogous to claim 1.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 27, 2006

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438